

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is responsive to amendment filed on December 3, 2007, where applicant amended claims 1-7,10,13-31. Claims 1-31 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, filed 12/3/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4 under 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of **Srivastava (US Patent Publication No 2005/0160431)**, as outlined below. Applicants arguments are therefore moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.
3. Previous 101 rejections are withdrawn.
4. Examiner acknowledges amendment to the specification filed on 7/10/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1-31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Srivastava (US Patent Publication No 2005/0160431).**

7. In reference to claim 1, Srivastava teaches a method for tracking an execution of a single request across a request identification boundary in a system, the method comprising:

providing a trace log for recording one or more events that occur during the execution of the single request across the request identification boundary, the request identification boundary comprising a change to an identification of the single request during the occurrence of the one or more events (¶ 16, Srivastava discloses a trace log for a query (i.e. request) of an application that spans across multiple threads);

first recording, within the trace log, a first event including a first request identification; second recording, within the trace log, a second event including a second request identification (¶ 17 lines 2-6); and

storing linking information within the trace log comprising marking within the trace log, the change to the identification of the single request from the first request identification to the second request identification (¶ 17 lines 6-10, ¶ 19 and ¶ 20).

8. In reference to claim 2, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the request identification boundary corresponds to processing the single request by a first and a second server component (¶ 16 lines 1-7 and Figure 4).

9. In reference to claim 3, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the request identification boundary corresponds to processing the single request by a first and a second thread (¶ 21).

10. In reference to claim 4, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the request identification boundary corresponds to changing the identification of the single request while completing a same transaction arising from the request (¶ 21).

11. In reference to claim 5, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the request identification boundary corresponds to transferring the single request from a first machine to a second machine (§ 23).
12. In reference to claim 6, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of correlating, by a consumer utility, the first and second events to the request using the linking information (§s 16 and 19).
13. In reference to claim 7, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising applying by the consumer utility, a set of trace records for the request, including event records for the first and second events, to a state machine (§ 17).
14. In reference to claim 8, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 7 wherein the state machine models a sequence of events corresponding to a composite request (§ 17).
15. In reference to claim 9, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 7 wherein an event type value is stored for each recorded event and wherein the event type value directs progression of the state machine (§s 19 and 21).
16. In reference to claim 10, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the storing linking information step is performed after the first recording event and before the second recording step (§s 19 and 21).
17. In reference to claim 11, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the linking information comprises a request identification transition event record, and wherein the request identification transition event record includes: a transition event identifier, the first request identification, and the second request identification (§s 17-19).

18. In reference to claim 12, Srivastava teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the first recording step and second recording step each comprises storing a timestamp corresponding to the first and second events, respectively (§s 17-19).

19. In reference to claims 13-24, 25-28 and 29-31, these claims respectively teach an event framework, an event utility, and an event record provider which all correspond to the method claims of claims 1-12. Therefore, claims 13-24, 25-28 and 29-31 are rejected based upon the same rationale as the above rejections of claims 1-12.

Conclusion

20. The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and/or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached Form 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAMY M. OSMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RMO

April 25, 2008

/Ramy M Osman/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2157